



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,528	10/26/2002	Carl Michael Dennison	BLD920010032US2	2146

46917 7590 05/09/2006

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP.  
ATTN: IBM37  
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210  
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

HUNTSINGER, PETER K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/065,528	DENNISON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter K. Huntsinger	2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Peter K. Huntsinger.  (3) David W. Victor.  
 (2) Kimberly Williams. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 01 May 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Robinson et al. Publication 2002/0080402, Hanse Patnet 6,509,974, and Suzuki et al. Patent 5,923,013.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney and examiner discussed the rejections to the claims, specifically claim 1. The attorney argued that Hansen did not teach updating job tickets or altering a print source file. A mutual understanding of both the examiner's and the applicant's positions was achieved. The examiner agreed to further consider the arguments when filed in a Request for Reconsideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**KIMBERLY WILLIAMS**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**



  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.